

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

A substitute specification is submitted in order to correct the numerous errors in the original specification that resulted from the electronic submittal of the original patent application. The examiner agreed that submission of a substitute specification would be the optimal manner in which to correct the errors in the original electronically submitted specification.

An interview was conducted with the examiner on October 19, 2004. The interview was summarized in the attached form. The examiner discussed that the loft, lie, and shaft length were the critical features of the invention and should be emphasized. The examiner further discussed the lesser importance of the wooden club heads due to the fact that even many current iron club sets use wooden club heads. The examiner also viewed one of the clubs and watched a short video on the design and use of the clubs.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 8, 9, 12, and 13 remain in this application. Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, 10, 11, and 14 have been withdrawn.

Claims 1, 5, and 9 are amended to delete the references to wooden golf club heads in order to focus on the essence of the invention; namely golf clubs that feature unique combinations of loft angles (between 34 and 55 degrees), lie angles (between 66 and 70 degrees), and shaft lengths (34.5 and 37.5 inches). The loft angles are those which are normally identified with irons used for the intermediate game, i.e. golf shots from 100 to 250 yards from the green.

However, clubs with this unique combination of loft angles, lie angles, and shaft lengths when used with a putting-type motion can be used for golf shots of less than 100 yards from the green.

The examiner rejected claims 1 – 13 as being unpatentable under 35 U.S.C. over Liao in view of Bamberger, Marciniak, Honma and Mason. The amendments to claims presented above remove references to wooden golf club heads and metallic sole plates thereby rendering the Bamberger, Marciniak, and Honma patents as being moot with respect to the claimed inventions.

The one remaining issue is the patentability of the instant invention given Liao in view of Mason. The Liao patent discloses clubs with a wide range of loft angles (10 to 60 degrees); a wide range of lie angles (65 to 90 degrees) and a shaft length of “about 34 inches.” The loft and lie angles of the instant invention clearly fall within the broad ranges of the Liao patent. However, the Liao patent clearly understates one of the primary features of the instant invention – namely, that the shaft length has to be considerably shorter than the length of a normal iron golf club in order to restrict the arm and shoulder motion of the golfer in order to reduce the velocity with which the club head strikes the ball, thereby allowing the golfer more control as would be required for shots within 100 yards of the green.

The instant invention claims shaft lengths of between 34.5 and 37.5 inches – optimally configured to restrict arm and shoulder motion in order to take advantage of the control offered by the putting motion while at the same time not creating a physically uncomfortable situation

Appl. No. 10/604,787
Amdt. dated February 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of August 24, 2004

for the golfer that shaft lengths less than 34.5 inches would create due to the fact that the golfer would have to bend over to the point where it may affect his or her swings.

The Mason patent discloses shaft lengths "from a range defined between or by at least 35, 40, 46 and 50 inches." However, the Mason patent is for a considerably different type of golf club that is gripped in a different way than the instant invention. The Mason club has a significantly different head and requires a significantly different method of addressing the ball. Clearly, the shaft length does not play the important role in the Mason club as it does in the instant invention.

Applicant respectfully submits that the Mason patent teaches away from Liao and therefore it is not appropriate to combine these references in order to come up with an obviousness rejection.

Please contact the undersigned at 860-930-3074 if you have any comments or questions.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard L. Bigelow, Esq.
Registration Number: 46,038
Phone: 860-930-3074

Attachments